DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 849 EA 021 544

AUTHOR Wilson, Joan B.
TITLE Perestroika's Impact on Educational Policy Formulation, 1984-89: USSR National Priorities Influence School Reform.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 64p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (Cambridge, MA, March 31-April 2, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Decentralization; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Policy Formation; Public Education; Teacher Role; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Restructuring; *USSR

ABSTRACT

Sweeping political, economic and social reforms in the USSR have affected educational policy making. Of the many important steps taken within the last 5 years to recast educational matters, at least three merit serious consideration, and these are described and analyzed in this paper. The first, the adoption of Fundamental Directions of General Education and Vocational School Reform (1984), set in motion four important goals: (1) the entrance of six year olds into the primary school; (2) the incorporation of a universal vocational educational core in the general education program; (3) the strengthening of the role of the teacher; and (4) the reorganization and decentralization of school administration. The second aspect, dubbed the Pedagogy of Cooperation, identifies the sporadic but intense effort to change classroom instructional strategies, away from the authoritarianism of the past and toward learning as collaboration between teacher and pupil. The third aspect highlights the debates of the All-Union Congress of Workers in Public Education (December 1988), an event that exemplied the spirit of glasnost (openness) and set a precedent for public professional debate in the Soviet Union. (77 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED314849

Perestroika's Impact on Educational Policy Formulation, 1984-1989:

USSR National Priorities Influence School Reform

by

Joan B. Wilson
Professor of Educational Administration
California State University, Los Angeles

A Paper Presented at the
Comparative and International Education Society Conference

Harvard University
March 31 - April 2, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan B. Wilson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: *PERESTROIKA'S* IMPACT

EA 021 544

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper examines how the initiation of sweeping political, economic and social reforms in the USSR have impacted educational policy making. Armed with an unprecedented blueprint for change Soviet leader Gorbachev has been the catalyst for a monumental restructuring (*perestroika)* of society. His compelling proposals and charasmatic personality have convinced many in his constituency that, indeed, too many Soviet citizens have lost their sense of personal and national destiny. Gorbachev intends to rebuild the world of his countrymen by strengthening the commitment of each citizen. This rededication will depend in part upon an improved system of education. Among the many important steps taken within the last five years to recast matters educational, at least three merit serious consideration. The first, the adoption of Fundamental Directions of General Education and Vocational School Reform (1984), set in motion at least four important goals: (1) the entrance of six year olds into the primary school to begin the educational process at a more formative point; (2) the incorporation of a universal vocational educational core in the general education program to prepare students for their prescribed roles in the world of work; (3) the strengthening of the role of the teacher in Soviet education and society to improve the effectiveness of instruction and guidance of youth; and (4) the reorganization and decentralization of school

administration to make the delivery system more incisive as well as responsive to needs in a multi-national school system. The second, dubbed the Pedagogy of Cooperation, has sparked nationwide discussion about new teacher-initiated instructional methods. Frustrated by the impersonal subject-centered curriculum and its inability to provide a dynamic learning environment teacher-innovators working at the local level have reset their priorities. Their new educational strategies focus on a child-centered curriculum and set trust and collaboration between teachers and students as pedagogical cornerstones. The spirit of *glasnost* (openness) has helped publicize this movement as well as challenge the *status quo* represented by some members in the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. The third, the All-Union Congress of Workers in Public Education (December, 1988), has showcased for all the world to see the philosophic struggles which are engaging the Soviet educational community. Five thousand delegates, no longer rubber stamping Party and bureaucratic mandates, debated what the new school should be. Candid revelations by the representatives defined the enormity of the problems in education as well as the confusion and ambivalence among educational interest groups. The importance of such an assemblage depends not only upon the specific resolutions adopted but also upon the precedent established to hold a national, professional conference in an unrestricted public arena. The permanence and ultimate significance of all these actions will

depend upon the strength of Gorbachev's leadership to keep the nation unified and focused on revitalizing national priorities. Within this context the champions of educational reform can begin to contend with voices of conservative criticism and to compete for limited resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: THE *PERESTROIKA* RATIONALE AND CONSEQUENCES...7

SCOPE OF THE 1984 EDUCATIONAL REFORMS. A BUMPY JOURNEY.....10

The Entrance of the Six Year Olds.....11

The Goal of Universal Vocational Education.....16

The Teacher in Soviet Society.....20

Optimizing the Administration of Public Education.....23

THE PEDAGOGY OF COOPERATION: A GRASS ROOTS RESPONSE.....30

Changes in Instructional Emphasis.....31

Unprecedented Public and Professional Commentary.....36

Enter the Teacher Scholar.....37

The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Strikes Back.....38

Inspectors and Scholars Favor the New Pedagogy.....42

THE ALL-UNION CONGRESS OF WORKERS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION, DECEMBER,1988.....45

CONCLUSION.....53

REFERENCES.....56

INTRODUCTION: THE *PERESTROIKA* RATIONALE AND CONSEQUENCES

Observers of the world scene as well as students of comparative international education are aware of the well publicized efforts underway in the Soviet Union to restructure its major institutions.[1] Crucial to the success of these efforts is the potency of educational policy makers to change as well as strengthen the kinds of educational opportunities available both to the young and adult populations.[2]

This paper describes and analyses three aspects of educational reform within this framework. The first relates to the formulation of educational policy through the adoption of Fundamental Directions of General Education and Vocational School Reform (1984). The second identifies a sporadic but intense effort to change classroom instructional strategies, dubbed the Pedagogy of Cooperation. The third highlights the debates and resolutions of the All Union Congress of Workers in Public Education (1988). It seems a foregone conclusion that no substantive reform aimed at transforming the attitudes, ideas, and practice in both domestic and foreign policy can succeed without major revisions in the total approach to the pedagogy practiced.

President Mikhail S. Gorbachev's dramatic analysis of problems in the USSR identified every major thread in the fabric of society as frayed or torn and typified the high level of concern espoused by Soviet leaders in the 1980's. (In April, 1985 at the Twenty-seventh Party Congress a comprehensive plan was adopted to translate a platform of reforms into concrete socio-economic programs which would involve millions of people.)

Gorbachev's compelling arguments espoused in his best seller, *Perestroika,* pivot on education as a key determinant for the direction and rate of change. (These tenets are not inconsistent with approaches found in the Pedagogy of Cooperation and in the sentiments expressed by the All-Union Congress of Workers in Public Education. See below.)

Consistent with socialist ideology, Gorbachev has made a strong case for polytechnic education[3] with its main focus on training youth for future work consistent with the requirements of scientific and technological progress. (It appears that education will continue to be viewed by national leadership as the means by which economic goals of the nation are to be achieved.) Gorbachev has paired this priority with support for humanistic education, a familiar old pillar in the philosophic mosaic of Russian thought.[4] Over decades humanism in Soviet pedagogy has

incorporated a key dimension, "the aim of which is a proper upbringing and the acquisition of adequate cultural standards." This issue of socialist upbringing, a major and comprehensive set of principles, has caused the Soviets great consternation as so many teachers have been very ineffective in inculcating the doctrines of Leninism and the standards of Communism in the youth of today.

Mindful of this as well as the general need for teachers to instruct more creatively and to foster initiative and independence among learners Gorbachev has promised to reward those presently in service who upgrade their teaching skills and general level of education. In addition he is calling for a more sophisticated professional work force as necessary to be recruited, trained, and retained to meet these ends. A personnel program with these dimensions will add substantially to the costs for educational reform, and Grobachev has promised the necessary financial backing.[5]

Many agreed with Gorbachev's personal acknowledgement that too many Soviet citizens had lost their sense of personal and national destiny. The notion of *perestroika* struck a responsive chord. Mikhail Sergeyevich was the catalyst, but the receptivity and cooperation of a great nation was necessary to make it happen. The educational intelligensia began to express publicly long held

private concerns that students throughout the country had diminished motivation, curiosity, and purpose, and that the educational system had sunk into the same morass as the economic and political system. The time was ripe for educational reform at the national level and resulted in a remarkable document, Fundamental Directions of General Education and Vocational School Reform (1984).

Without question history will judge ultimately the wisdom of these reforms and those which follow by the contribution education can make to its citizens for a better life. In Soviet terms this will translate into a revitalized economy and new personal and political freedoms.

THE SCOPE OF THE 1984 EDUCATIONAL REFORMS. A BUMPY JOURNEY

Abetted by the spirit of *glasnost* (openness) millions of people participated in a remarkable number of meetings. Eighteen months (June, 1983 to December, 1984) prior to the adoption of Fundamental Directions they debated and discussed appropritate solutions to persistent educational problems.[6]

As might be expected, the rising expectations created by this unprecedented publicity began to sow the seeds of discontent

among the Soviet people when the government's effort flagged in the following two years (1984-1986).[7]

At the time, however, on April 10th and 12th, respectively, the CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the USSR Supreme Soviet endorsed with great fanfare forty-one separate reform statements on education, organized into eight separate categories.[8] Among the more notable were those relating to the lowering of admission age to the first grade from seven to six years old, thus extending the (universal) general education school from a ten to an eleven year program (reform * 4); the providing for universal general vocational education (reform *5); the improving of working conditions for teachers, including pay raises (reform * 34); and optimizing the administration of public education (reforms * 38-41).[9] An interim analysis of these four reforms just twenty-four months (1986) after their adoption indicates the kinds of roadblocks facing the Soviets.

The Entrance of the Six Year Olds. The Soviet educational community long had been convinced that six year olds had the ability to meet the demands of the primary school curriculum. Successful programs dating back to the 1930's demonstrating the psychological and physiological readiness of the six year olds to matriculate are well documented in Soviet Union studies. The 1984 reforms then made universal a highly regarded practice, the

implementation of which depended upon available space. The additional year of instruction also provided at least two distinct advantages from the standpoint of national purpose.

First, the Soviets have always had a tremendous interest in inculcating the Marxist-Leninist ideology of upbringing. Broadly defined this has meant that young Soviet citizens learn an integrated system of Communist ideas, attitudes, and concepts, which shape their total personality and world view.[10] To achieve this, opportunities to practice and perfect these important principles realistically need to be present in every arena of the learners' environment so that they can become productive members of society in Soviet terms. As mentioned previously, thoughtful observers have shuddered at the state of indifference and lethargy of so many Soviet youth. They have appeared to lack any understanding or interest in Communist morality with its emphasis on a sense of civic duty and commitment to the proposition that all the benefits enjoyed by society and its members depend on the honest and dedicated labor of each. The chance now to engage the minds of the young in formal instruction one year earlier holds the promise to strengthen the upbringing component and restore the moral fibre of society.

Second, for those children learning Russian as a second language, no small problem in a country with more than one hundred

languages, the additional year of instruction is viewed as a way to facilitate mastery and help solidify national purpose.[11] .

Facility planners anticipating the onslaught calculated that between 1986 and 1990 an estimated 1.2 million six year olds could be phased into the primary schools. The largest cohort was expected in 1990. At best this was an ambitious undertaking as in 1984 the number of six year olds in the first grade was unknown but estimated to be very small. However, the planners were confident that space available would develop from the drop in the national birthrate and from the shrinkage in national school enrollment, down from 49.2 to 44.3 million between 1970 and 1980.[12]

It now appears that these projections were faulty and that many more six year olds are seeking enrollment than can be accommodated, at least in the 1980's. (The latest count halfway through the Twelfth Five Year Plan (1988) indicated that half of the six year old cohort was enrolled and that plans to extend the elementary program from three to four years were well underway.)[13]

Overcrowding will still continue to be a problem although the 1984 reforms promised relief. (Reform #12. "Extreme class overcrowding is to be relieved." The optimal size for grades I-IX,

30; grades X-XI, 25.)[14] Statistics on overcrowding have been unavailable until recently. With the advent of *glasnost* the Soviet press and other publications are beginning to present data which describe dramatically the parameters of the problem. A fifty percent overload exists in nurseries for six months to three year old children where the norm is eighteen and in the three year kindergartens where the norm is twenty-five per class .[15]

In 1986 thirty percent of Soviet schools housed eight million elementary and secondary students who used these facilities on a daily double session basis. There is no question that the advent of the six year old population has intensified school housing problems despite a school construction target to increase space by twenty percent, a Twelfth Five-Year Plan goal, 1986-1990.[16]

A speech given by G. Y. Yagodin, the head of the new USSR State Committee on Public Education, in the summer of 1988 indicated that solutions to these kinds of problems continue to elude the Soviets. He reported that half the country's schools do not have central heating, running water or sewerage. One-fourth of the children attend school in two shifts; some of them in three shifts. Some one and a half million children do not at the present have the opportunity to attend kindergarten. "These are old problems. There has been virtually no increase in the percentage of national income spent on public education in the past years...."[17]

The health of these schoolchildren continues to be of serious concern. The Ministry of Education reported that fifty-three percent of children are unhealthy, and that the percentage of unhealthy children increases from sixty-six percent to seventy-five percent during the period of instruction.[18]

In another speech in December of 1988 Yagodin suggested at least one cause for the scarcity of space in educational housing. "...builders and local agencies have been responsible for the irretrievable loss at our facilities of more than one billion rubles allocated by the government for the construction of educational institutions."[19]

Despite these misappropriations Gorbachev reported earlier that construction of secondary schools and nurseries and kindergartens was up twenty-two percent and thirty percent, respectively.[20] Yet reports stream in from all parts of the Soviet Union expressing alarm over governmental building priorities. A director of a school in the Khorezm Region of Uzbek noted that twenty thousand children had been born in the city of Urgench, yet schools accommodating only four thousand had been built in the same time period. Considering this acute shortage of schools it had made the director's heart ache to see the zeal with which all kinds of luxurious hotels and magnificant administrative

buildings had been built and to see the headquarters of these projects headed up by city and region officials.[21]

As noted below it is doubtful that the Soviet economy can address fully a seventy year build-up of educational needs, exaccerbated by stronger competition from other Soviet institutions and power bases (*e.g.* the Party and governmental bureaucracy, the military establishment, heavy/light industries, and agriculture.) The costs for new and improved school facilities are staggering. Although exact projections from the USSR are not readily available, comparable figures from California which is projecting a new student population of 780,000 over a five year period (1986-1991) provide a scale. The Department of Finance estimates that twenty-six thousand new classrooms will cost at least $3.8 billion and that deferred maintenance requests will total more than $2 billion by 1990.[22] As the U.S. and USSR school population is approximately the same size and California represents one tenth of that population, it is clear that funds for facilities will present an ongoing challenge for both countries.

<u>The Goal of Universal Vocational Education.</u> Serious difficulties lie ahead for the Soviets in their ideal to incorporate a universal vocational education emphasis within the tracks of the general education program. This has been a time-honored socialist principle to train youth for the world of work and strategic

placement into employment which meets the goals of national priorities.

A review of the planned new organizational structure and projected percentages of students in Soviet schools suggests implementation problems.

Elementary School:	Grades I-IV (100%)
Incomplete Secondary School:	Grades V-I (100%)
Complete Secondary School:	Grades X-XI (100%)

**Strand 1 Secondary Vocational-Technical Schools (67%)

**Strand 2 Sr. Secondary General Education Schools (33%)[23]

At first glance it would seem that the expansion of universal vocational education (the opportunity to master an occupation before starting to work) should be well underway at least among sixty-seven percent of secondary school graduates. However, the above percentages have not been realized and represent targets for 1990. The present distribution of students finds about sixty percent in the senior secondary general education school and an estimated forty percent divided between innumerable vocational-technical schools and the newly designed secondary vocational-technical school. Nevertheless, even among the forty percent population of vocational technical school graduates disturbing

statistics suggest a need for better career counseling to promote employment stability.

L. A. Kostin, the First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Committee for Labor and School Problems, an agency responsible for overseeing the entrance of youth into the work force, has reported that fifteen to twenty percent of vocational-technical school entrants are not well suited personally for the work they have selected. As a result from twenty to thirty percent of the vocational-technical school graduates do not show up at the places where, legally, they are to fulfill a job placement immediately after graduation. Furthermore, forty percent of these graduates change their occupations shortly after entering the labor force. At present, an overwhelming majority of Soviet youths are not being trained for specific careers that they will follow after graduation beyond a short period of employment.[24] The abilities and inclinations of the students along with the wishes of their parents and recommendations from the incomplete secondary schools, it seems, must be given a higher priority

The goal of vocational education in the senior secondary general education school seems even more problematic and has caused extensive comment among the Soviets themselves and students of comparative education in the USSR. At a national conference on vocational education (1985) Moldavian Republic Minister of

Education, D. G. Zidu recognized the dysfunctionality in training "the better prepared youth with high level intellectual potential" in both a full academic curriculum of general education studies simultaneoulsy for work in "the more simple occupations."[25] This issue continues to cause serious debate among educators and other planners for the future.[26] Recent action directing the revision of this reform was taken at the February, 1988 plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU which reflected the widespread skepticism concerning the wisdom of training all general education secondary school students for mass, semiskilled occupations in the Soviet economy.[27])

Still the Soviets are not going to let the goal of universal vocational education be thwarted in the general education school as increasing numbers of seventeen year olds must be prepared for places in the labor force. For certain the demands of the national economy will prevail. One arrangement has included extracurricular courses at production training workshops and farming plots located directly at schools and at local or district inter-school production training centers. In 1986 it was estimated that thirty-five percent of senior grade students underwent job training in workshops located directly at the industrial enterprises.[28] Vocational education aside, all students within the general education school curriculum must study <u>polytechnical education</u> with its emphasis on learning the scientific principles

underlying industrial and agricultural production and their major applications. Such a curriculum forges a pedagogical link to Soviet Marxist ideology, *i.e.* "to strengthen the tie of the school to life."[29]

The Teacher in Soviet Society. "Success in resolving the complex tasks of the teaching and upbringing of youth depends to a decisive extent, upon the teacher, (the level) of his ideological conviction, his professional mastery, erudition, and (the level of his overall) cultivation."[30] Reform #30 pledges a monumental effort to elevate the teachers' spiritual and intellectual life and improve the standards of their professional training for what is truly "a high calling." Special emphasis has been promised to upgrade their material situation.[31]

The allocation of resources to achieve these goals has placed education in the Soviet Union as a major contender for financial support in a hard pressed economy of the 1980's. Beatrice Szekely and others have documented well the vital need for teacher reforms to succeed as basic to the overall permanence of *perestroika*. Without it the necessary improved morale of teachers and their accompanying improved performance will fail to materialize. This cannot help but cause a serious dimunition in the scope of the reforms realized. Also a failure to upgrade the creature comforts for professionals will continue to make it

unattractive for teachers to work in the outlying rural areas where forty percent of the Soviet children live. Soviet men have not been recruited to the ranks for apparent reasons, too. At present between seventy and eighty percent of the profession are women.[32] At a recent conference of the Comparative International and Educational Society, Dr. Zoya Malkova, a noted Soviet educator, emphasized in her address the importance in finding teachers of excellence who could affect the quality of instruction. She wondered aloud, "but where do we find these people?"[33]

Available statistics show that salaries in Soviet education have not kept up with those for other professional groups. In 1982 the average monthly salary of workers in public education, including highly paid instructors in higher education, was 137.5 rubles. This ranked fourteenth place among comparative groups and reflected a slippage from ninth place in 1965. To remedy these deficiencies in April, 1984 Chairman Chernenko announced an overall salary increase of 35.7 percent for Ministry of Education employees in the preschool and general education school, a 30.4 percent increase for vocational-technical school teachers, and a 29.7 percent increase for those at secondary specialized institutions. All these were to be phased in between 1984 and 1987.[34]

More recent statistics (1988) report an average salary for the education sector of 195 rubles, still under the 203 rubles that is average for industrial workers and white collar employees. Among the most poorly paid and those for whom the most critical demand had been generated are elementary teachers (usually in rural areas) employed at school boarding hostels; teachers at children's state homes; and teachers at vocational-technical schools for agriculture and the mining industry. These categories of professionals received the first round of salary improvement. The next critical target group which has received increases are teachers and administrators in those geographic areas of the country with the worst shortage of qualified professionals: the far north, far east, the Urals economic region, and other hard to staff places. The prospects still do not look good (1989).

Yagodin reports that the teacher's lack of prestige and low social status remains the major problem. A teacher cannot get housing. The situation is severe. According to data from an investigation conducted by the teacher trade union's central committee, at present over three hundred thousand teachers are waiting to obtain housing. One-fifth of all urban teachers live in dormatories, and one-third of all rural teachers rent space from the public. In rural areas of the Ukraine and Georgia, more than half of the teachers are in this position.[35]

As reflected in reforms #30-35, underway are efforts to reduce the teaching load for primary school teachers from twenty-four to twenty hours of lesson time per week, to increase the length of the training programs at pedagogical institutes from four to five years for teachers of the school disciplines, to initiate frequent (every four to five years) teacher retraining programs, to upgrade the quality of teacher training in the universities and to mandate that universities do more to help pedagogical higher educational institutions in the development of scientific research work and in raising the qualifications of research and teaching cadres.[36]

Optimizing the Administration of Public Education. From reforms #38-41 it is clear that existing administrative organs are to be overhauled for the purpose of pursuing "unswervingly" a single governmental policy for the education and upbringing of the "rising generation". Important steps to streamline the inspection and monitoring system for schools and other teaching and upbringing institutions are to be initiated.

Especially important to the reformers is the elimination of the spate of sundry injunctions, reports, and inquiries that "distract educational collectives from their vital, creative job of instructing and nurturing pupils." In the place of excessive bureaucratic oversight the reformers have specified that more

time be paid to the study, popularization, and application of advanced teaching and upbringing experience.[37] This has led to a popular conviction that decentralization of administration will help to eliminate the Soviet pre-occupation with conformity, regulation, and rigidity.

The role of principals in the general education schools and vocational-technical training schools also has come under the purview of the reformers. Principals have been advised to exercise creativity in organizing the teaching and upbringing process. Those responsible for the work of these principals have been cautioned to reduce their academic work load. The importance of the grade level teacher's role and authority has been underscored, too.

Those in the role of evaluation, presumably these principals, grade level teachers, and regional inspectors, have been instructed to develop demonstrably valid criteria by which to measure the work done by the teacher and the school. Suggested criteria for this evaluation have included more objective standards upon which to base student learning. This results-oriented system of measurement has specified that the success of school and teacher activity be held up against standards defined first of all by the depth and durability of the knowledge they impart, by the ideological and moral qualities that their wards

exhibit, and by their readiness for life and labor.[38] It is interesting to note that the reformers have not acknowledged that despite the naming of these criteria, measurement and evaluation of student progress continue to vex professional education in every country of the world, no matter how prescribed the educational philosophy. The complexity of the human organism has defied definitive analysis.

To accomplish all this an administrative shakeup in the top eschelons of education became a reality when Gorbachev appointed (1985), Sergei Georgievich Shcherbakov as USSR Minister of Education.[39]

In Shcherbakov the reform movement found an able administrator determined to improve the administration of the national school and the teacher training system under his jurisdiction. Shcherbakov carved out a role for himself in which he chose to comment on the broader issues as he saw them. A primary target was inept school administration and persistent problems in the organization of educational research at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, an organizational unit in the Ministry of Education. It was he who announced the new school curriculum, consistent with the reformed, eleven year structure of the general education school, and the planned advent of six year olds into the new first grade.[40]

The new political leadership which Shcherbakov represented at the time reflected Gorbachev's commitment to establishing a more effective delivery system, as distinguished from the faltering maneuvers of former bureaucrats. It did not signify that truly radical reforms were in the wings but that changes would be made in a measured way. The object was to improve the existing order without fundamentally transforming the present social, political, and economic foundations or going beyond the prevailing ideological values.[41] The overriding considerations continued to be improving the compulsory general education program and expanding vocational educational opportunities, thereby preparing all pupils for their future work. A minority of the students were scheduled to go onto further education.

As mentioned above, changes in the basic organization of the school system were intended to provide the necessary format for other reforms. Shcherbakov's administration of the Soviet preschool/school system (as differentiated from higher education and vocational education) faced enormous challenges to accomplish this reorganization. These stemmed from a holdover system used by the Soviets to train and place their youth from the age of fifteen into the world of work. The imperative to meet national economic goals coupled with limited space in a national senior secondary program had prompted each of the fifteen

republics to establish alternative training routes. The result was a proliferation of vocational-technical schools run by the many ministries in the industrial, agricultural, and service sectors of the economy. The goal of these schools was to train skilled job recruits in narrowly specialized programs of from one to three years' duration. The State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, not within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, had provided uneven coordination and direction of these schools.

The reforms addressed this problem and called for all these present vocational-technical schools to be combined into the new secondary vocational-technical school. The course of study is to include a slightly modified version of the senior secondary school curriculum combined with an occupational training program. Plans have been made to establish other new vocational-technical schools for graduates of the complete general secondary education school which will offer an additional year of occupational training. The reformers also have envisioned a redistribution of the intake percentages of fifteen year olds between the senior secondary general education school and the secondary vocational-technical school (or present vocational-technical school) as they now stand. Currently about two thirds of the fifteen year olds go onto the senior secondary general education school and one third to the vocational-technical schools. The goal is to reverse these percentages by end of the Twelfth Five Year Plan in 1990.[42]

Shcherbakov's success depended upon his ability to smooth out a number of tough problems. First, he had to deal with the difficulties inherent in the Ministry's expansion of the vocational-technical school programs, both pre-and post-general secondary education school. Second, he needed to support the State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education's efforts to coordinate the many ministries involved in vocational-technical education throughout the Republic. Yet, Shcherbakov was powerless to straighten out the organizational and jurisdictional overlap between that Committee's operation and his own. Third, he had to wage a public relations campaign in the education community and with parents and students for the planned (and unpopular) redistribution of the fifteen year old population. Fourth, he had to trouble-shoot the inevitable overlap in responsibilities between the Ministry of Education and the State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education in overseeing the general education curriculum and the teacher training program.[43] Shcherbakov's limited span of control undermined his chances to effect any changes on a grand scale in the limited amount of time given him.[44]

Overall coordination seemed the key especially in view of the reverberations school reform was continuing to make on higher education programs. The disjointed organizational structure from

first grade through graduate education in the fifteen republics permitted redundancies in instruction, supported miscalculation in the numbers of students needed for important jobs in the economy, tolerated the lack of quality and excellence in programs, and encouraged teachers, administrators, and staff in their complacency and satisfaction with the *status quo*. Problems of this magnitude demanded action.

As Gorbachev has been unrelenting in his drive to create nothing less than a new Soviet Union within the foreseeable future, he made a bold administrative change. In April, 1988 the Politburo CPSU Central Committee approved his plan for a newly created USSR State Committee on Public Education, headed up by Gennady Yagodin (formerly Minister of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education). This new State Committee united in one department the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, and the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education. It has been charged with developing strategies for instruction and upbringing and for forecasting and long-term planning in those domains. The expectation is that local educational administration units will have more authority and that substantial reductions in the number of administrative personnel will occur.[45] Too much centralization based on bureaucratic commands was blamed for all the failed reforms of the past.

A careful monitoring of the many fateful decisions of the new Committee on Public Education will provide the evidence necessary to determine how powerful its impact will be on the change process and how comfortablely the system can tolerate it.

THE PEDAGOGY OF COOPERATION: A GRASS ROOTS RESPONSE

Within the heady atmosphere of the rising expectations created by all the activity and publicity surrounding educational reform and in the spirit of *glasnost* which has permitted a tolerance for differing opinions, new voices began to influence educational policy. In the Spring of 1986 articles started to appear in *Uchitel'skaia gazeta* (*Teachers' Gazette*) publicizing the highly successful work of a few teachers in the USSR. From this relatively inauspicious beginning has emerged a small, but unusual coalition of teacher-innovators, administrators, and academics in education who have laid seige to the establishment (the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences) and established ways (an over-supervised content-oriented curriculum).

Apparently the initial motivation for those in the schools to seek more successful attempts to meet the needs of their students stemmed from the 1970's with the extension of compulsory

schooling through the secondary level. The unrelenting official expectation was that all, not just a majority, would graduate. Teachers found it increasingly difficult to teach the rigorous academic curriculum prepared by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences to the new mass intake of students. Those in the schools became increasingly frustrated with State textbooks and recommended teaching methods as they found them totally inappropriate. Teachers, for their part, were criticized roundly for rampant grade inflating practices, a reaction on their part to meeting the planned graduation quotas.[46]

With these kinds of pressures teachers looked increasingly toward the work of certain exceptionally innovative teachers whose success in classroom instructional practices was known throughout the underground network of Soviet teachers. The USSR Ministry of Education and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences (with some notable exceptions) tended to discount the work and reputations of these professionals, and it was only after extreme pressure and publicity that official recognition of their strategies happened.

Changes in Instructional Emphasis. The spokesmen for the Pedagogy of Cooperation[47] issued an eighteen point statement printed in the October 18, 1986 issue of *Uchitel'skaia gazeta* in

which they outlined many of the important concepts each had held for more than twenty-five years. The focal point of these ideas dealt with relations between teachers and pupils, the Pedagogy of Cooperation. The teacher-innovators defined it as an instructional schema based upon the collaborative labor of both children and teachers in the teaching learning process. At the heart of such an approach was the exclusion of compulsion on the teacher's part to force children to learn. Over decades this has translated into actions taken by these teacher-innovators not to give bad grades, not to complain to parents about their children, and not to issue reprimands in class.

This approach was in marked contrast to the common conception of the conservative, rigid teacher who barked orders and demanded instant compliance to any request. No longer were collective meetings of parents to be held at school where the teachers berated children's misdeeds before all those assembled. (Parents defending their offspring risked that teachers would impose further punishments.)

From this follows a suggested list of strategies which when mastered are intended to produce children who love to think, who cherish the thinking process, who possess didactic abilities so that each can explain material to others, who possess organization and communication skills, who are people-oriented to one degree or

another, who are capable of creativity, and who possess a sense of social responsibility! Rote learning was to be minimized and children encouraged to think for themselves.

To achieve these kinds of results all the teachers in one way or another have relied on "support signals" which may be diagrams, key words, signs, or some other kind of referent for thought. These signals permit the pupils to condense or amplify the text they have been given to learn, a technique intended to facilitate greatly the understanding and recall of material. This process, the innovators claimed, excludes the possibility of rote learning and is an alternative to the problem-based method of thinking.[48]

Other successful methods have included teaching pupils to analyse their own work and the work of others in the class as a means of developing intellectual and personal self-reliance and independence. Another has involved presenting very advanced material at the time when beginning or intermediate concepts are being taught. This is done so that children can anticipate what is coming and will have the needed time for their thoughts to mature. [49]

The teachers also champion the consolidation of material into large blocks as a means to increase significantly the amount of material learned while sharply decreasing the pupil's workload.

In reviewing the block of work to be accomplished, students conceptualize the whole thus freeing themselves from the fear of difficulties. Once the block has been covered and the basic thought grasped, pupils can proceed calmly, sizing up the details and particulars.[50]

The teacher-innovators have concentrated on stimulating creativity in their own teaching and in the learning opportunities provided to the children. Whether the activity is academic, social, in the world of work, or in the realm of self-discipline, the basic rule used is "do everything creatively or don't do it at all."[51]

Attention was paid to a personality-based approach, point seventeen, which is differentiated from individualized instruction. The teacher-innovators acknowledged that every child brings to school his own world of feelings and experiences, precisely as the teacher does. In this sense, they view the teacher and child as equals. "They both have known joy, suffering, shame, fear, satisfaction, a sense of defeat, and a sense of victory."[52] No matter how much was stated about the need for individualized instruction, the teacher, overburdened with lessons and things to do, could not implement it to the full, according to the innovators. Thus the Pedagogy of Cooperation developed techniques to compensate for this limitation. Instead, activities and strategies are crafted in which each pupil feels himself to be a personality

and senses that the teacher's attention is directed at him personally.

Points sixteen and eighteen emphasized cooperation with parents and among teachers themselves. The point was that all the adults in the lives of children should be united in their efforts to educate and to nurture them. This presupposed a uniform set of demands and assumed friendly and comradely relations with children to produce an open and trusting response from them.

The Pedagogy of Cooperation concluded with an exhortation to all teachers to consider these methodologies and not to be fearful that they were too complicated, inapplicable, or unattainable. The teacher-innovators based these assurances upon their having had between twenty-five and forty years of teaching experience in all types of settings with all kinds of children and with all sorts of teachers, principals, and inspectors. These approaches did not need special conditions nor a different curriculum or textbooks, they have asserted. Teachers can do their own restructuring and should be free to make necessary adaptations. The teacher-innovators concluded with a caution that these recommended methodologies not be mandated but disseminated as widely as possible. At all costs, they urged, teachers must preserve in themselves certain child-like qualities of self-esteem,

vulnerability, capacity for enthusiasm, and delicacy of feeling if they were to maintian that special rapport with children.[53]

Unprecedented Public and Professional Commentary. These points so well stated roused public sentiment and touched a social nerve. From all parts of the Soviet Union letters to the editor poured into *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*. Teachers, administrators, academicians and the public at large found a rallying point for change in the Pedagogy of Cooperation. It became a beacon toward which extended opinions were drawn and organized. S. Soloveichik, the senior reporter on the *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, discussed at length several letters to the editor in which teachers debated the merits of the work of the teacher-innovators.[54]

Soloveichik's careful selection of these teacher responses became a vehicle for one more attack on the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. In this reporter's view the Academy, forced to acknowledge finally the work of the innovators, had continued to give lip service only to the movement. In summary, Soloveichik evaluated the present state of affairs in this way. It used to be that scholars and scientists thought things up, and teachers picked up on them. Then (in recent times) the education scholars, for a number of reasons, stopped thinking up anything, and the initiative passed to the teachers. In the field of didactics and in the theory of upbringing, he continued, the preeminent role in

scholarship had passed to practicing educators. A new type of scholar, the teacher-scholar, had appeared. The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences had for the moment lost out in competition with the school. Soloveichik concluded that this condition could be remedied, and when it was, it would be to the school's advantage.[55]

Enter the Teacher-Scholar. A special circumstance was in the making here. Where formerly the authors of the Pedagogy of Cooperation had been referred to as teacher-innovators, *Uchitel'skaia gazeta* was now dubbing them teacher-scholars. Some of their views were being published after long years of delay. A new respectability was coming their way; V. F. Shatalov was representative of the new breed. The author of several books and a co-signer of the Pedagogy of Cooperation Shatalov worked in an institute for teacher improvement and taught school in Donetsk. A transcript from a telecast in which he fielded many questions about his approaches and ideas showed Shatalov as a frustrated educational leader who plaintively begged for a school.[56]

His discourse with the questioners on the television program revealed Shatalov as the exemplar of the new methodology (support signals, trust in student-teacher-parental relationships, and a great emphasis on self-reliance).[57]

The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Strikes Back. The Academy took to the pages of *Uchitel'skaia gazeta* in a retaliatory article authored by eight of its members.[58] In a careful exposition of its activities, the members acknowledged that educational reforms demanded a sharp turnaround to face the needs of the classroom. The reported actions of the Academy included a complete review of all the problems associated with scientific research and a drive to reach concrete solutions to the problems of school reform. To accomplish this the Academy had focused on eight priority issues.[59] To operationalize these issues research collectives were being set up within the Academy to handle particularly important problems and experiments: the instruction of children from the age of six, the influence of computers on personality development, the content and methods of the work done by teaching and upbringing complexes, and so on. The authors recited an impressessive list of new publications, swelling the list of pedagogical works by twelve hundred titles each year.

In an effort to bring scientific research closer to classroom practice the Academy had established two new scientific research institutes "on urgent directions in pedagogical science."[60] The Academy authors acknowledged that they were dissatisfied with the quality of an entire array of scientific publications. "Certain laboratories are not doing any serious, forward-looking

experimental work." Teachers, they agreed, have some justified complaints to make about physics and mathematics textbooks and about several methodological texts on the problems of upbringing. These educators also admitted that relations between the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and teachers who were teaching creatively and with the People's Teachers of the USSR needed particular attention. A forth coming conference on the development of teacher initiative and creativity appeared to them to promise a remedy for this breakdown.

Thus having described the Academy in a proactive position on the 1984 reforms, eager to be collaborative with teachers, and totally in synchronization with the spirit of *perestroika*, the authors launched into a critique of the Pedagogy of Cooperation which minimized its universality and relevance. To them a recitation of successful classroom practices by innovative teachers could not constitute a scientific basis for a new pedagogy. They argued that the unique personalities of the teacher-innovators who chose to apply these instructional strategies would seem to have an undue influence on the reported successful outcomes.

However, the authors did not dispute that many facets of experience reported by the teacher-innovators had merit and represented extensions of existing classroom practices. Nevertheless, the Academy took exception to an important tenet of

the teacher-innovators, *i.e.*, non compulsion as a pre-condition for the teaching learning act. While it supported the campaign against authoritarian methods of upbringing, the authors objected to omitting the idea of reasonable demands in teaching and upbringing.[61]

The authors made a strong case to bolster their credibility as objective critics of the Pedagogy of Cooperation by reminding the readership that members of the Academy had written forwards to some of the books by the teacher-innovators and had, indeed, for the past several years been issuing titles in a new series called "Pedagogical Quest: Experience, Problems, Discoveries" (*Pedagogicheski poisk: opyt, problemy, nakhodki).* In another series it issued, called "Pedagogical Experience" (*Pedagogicheskii opyt),* the works of teacher-experimenters S. N. Lysenkova, E. N. Il'in, I. P. Volkov, V. F. Shatalov, and others had been printed. Also the Academy had issued reprints of popular tracts by Shatalov and Lysenkova in numbers exceeding two hundred thousand copies and the works of more than thirty other teachers engaged "in doing creative work."[62]

In a parting shot at some of their own members of the Academy the authors took issue with the writing of individual scholarly colleagues who "have been know to exaggerate the role of pedagogical demands" (on the part of the teacher) and of

punishments in teaching and upbringing. They asserted that the basic idea of cooperation between educators and pupils was not new, since outstanding educators, past and present -- Jan Comenius, Johann Pestalozzi, Adolf Diesterweg, Konstantin D. Ushkinskii, Nadezhda K. Krupskaia, Anton S. Makarenko, and Vasilii A. Sukhomlinskii -- have also stood for humanism rather than authoritrianism in teacher-pupil relations. "Love for the child, respect for the personality, is the underlying basis, the fundamental, nonnegotiable demand of Soviet and worldwide progressive pedagogy."[63]

A month following the appearance of this article reporter S. Soloveichik in the *Uchitel'skaia gazeta* took aim and fired. He was not in a mood to grant any concessions to the Academy. One issue greatly troubled him which he discussed with his usual passion in defending the Pedagogy of Cooperation.[64] It related to the Academy's challenge to learning without compulsion which it had interpreted to mean that no demands were to be placed on the learner. Soloveichik corrected this view, stating that learning without compulsion was not synonymous with learning without "demandingness" (or exactness).[65]

Soloviechik chided the Academy in its failure to understand that the new pedagogy's aim for school was to nuture feelings, and it was in this realm that "demand" had no relevance. An *a priori* condition was the

establishement of pupil trust in the school. "It is a simple matter: first win trust, then make demands *ad finitum*. Or make demands on credit while gradually winning trust and valuing it. Exigence without trust -- that is compulsion."[66]

In an effort to keep the pressure on the Academy and thereby build support for the Pedagogy of Cooperation, Soloveichik initiated a widespread discussion from his readership through a solicitation of letters to the editor and responses to a questionnaire which the paper had printed. Some three hundred replies came in which, when tabulated, indicated an overwhelming approval for the Pedagogy of Cooperation and criticism of the Academy.[67]

Inspectors and Scholars Favor the New Pedagogy. At the initiation of *Uchitel'skaia gazeta* two important meetings were held in the Fall of 1986 to organize other arenas of support for the Pedagogy of Cooperation. The first gathering was of public education inspectors from the Arkhangel'sk Regional Department of Public Education. Six of their members wrote a nine point report in which they analyzed their own work and reflected on ways in which applications from the proposed pedagogy could improve it.[68]

No less dedicated were the scholars, representatives from higher education[69] who authored a nine point report, which began:

> No matter what has been said, no matter how many noted successes pedagogical science has had (and there have been some, of course), no matter how we have tried to respond to the reproaches of public opinion, facts remain facts: pedagogical theory today is out of line with the perceived needs of society. Advanced practice has overtaken pedagogical theory.[70]

The scholars defended the work of the teacher-innovators as a serious contribution to scholarship and saw no juxtaposition of scholarship in opposition to innovation in their models. They called for new pedagogical textbooks, ones which "will be a work of art, a textbook that befits the subtle and complex art of upbring." And on the subject of upbringing the scholars decried its current emphasis and methodology. Serious changes need to be made, they asserted. "Upbringing is inconceivable without joint creative activity, but to date almost nothing is being done to arouse creativity, while at every step one encounters more and more limitations and formalities."[71]

The scholars made a promise to their future graduate students who would train to become educators and principals in their

pedagogical institutes of higher education. They would remain open to new influences. The professors' final summation: if school was a reflection of life, then the pedagogical institutes were a reflection of the school and should stay in advance of it through their leadership in ideas. The Pedagogy of Cooperation was presenting the opportunity for the consideration of exciting new ideas. Henceforth, the scholars in their courses and seminars would be tireless in support of innovation and seek further ways to rouse interest in and respect for them.[72]

Despite the strong endorsements for innovation widespread acceptance may be problematic. For example, even though the teacher-innovators have stressed that local conditions and preferences should influence the choice of instructional strategies and that their Pedagogy of Cooperation should not be mandated, this invitation to experiment may not be strong enough without continued public discussion. The main media spark which had kept the flame for innovation alive, *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, has been reorganized under the aegis of the CPSU Central Committee, where formally it had been an organ of the USSR State Committee on Public Education and the Central Committee of the Trade Union for Employees in Public Education and Science. Editorial board changes have been made, too. Its reform editor has been replaced. Without the potential for the newspaper spearheading the drive for the Pedagogy of Cooperation it remains to be seen what

vehicles or spokespersons will emerge to keep this kind of professional leadership energized.[73]

And without question, the enormity of the Soviet school system, forty-two million students in the nation's 130,000 schools, by itself raises unique logistical problems for the incorporation of any such "new pedagogies"

THE ALL-UNION CONGRESS OF WORKERS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION, DECEMBER, 1988

With the charge to pass resolutions setting the directions for education in the next decade, the All-Union Congress met for three historic days in an extraordinary session. Not since 1978 had such an assemblage been called. At the beginning heated debates among the five thousand attendees gave a glimpse of the divisiveness in the hall. In the end; however, opinions coalesced and agreement was reached on a number of fundamentals.

During the first day delegates battled with one another over the pros and cons of the Pedagogy of Cooperation. Administrators who spoke appeared critical of the Pedagogy as giving too much freedom to teachers; teachers lashed back at the authoritarian attitudes held by the administrators. Yagodin for his part

defended (but not strongly enough to satisfy *Uchitel'skaia gazeta)* many principles in the Pedagogy. "We must resolutely renounce the rigid schemes for organizing the lives of children and teenagers that are so characteristic of many teachers' collectives and most families. The content and methodology of labor upbringing require change. Uselessness and coercion are its most dangerous enemies...."[74] In a previous speech in the Fall of 1988 Yagodin left little doubt concerning his view on the locus of decision-making which would line him up with the teacher-innovators. "...(teachers) must be allowed to act as they see fit." And in another telling excerpt,

> The school council must be the main (decision-making) body -- a school council elected by the teachers by secret ballot. Perhaps one-fourth ...should be elected this way and another one-fourth elected by the pupils, either from the senior classes or starting at age fourteen. A certain number of parents and representatives of enterprises and organizations closely connected with the school should be delegated to the council. The council should be given the rights and authority to remove the director or fire a teacher and also be able to prevent the removal of the director or the firing of a teacher, as well as the power to control the budget. It must be founded on cooperative principles. Such a council should begin operating and assume all rights.[75]

That such a free-wheeling conference accommodating so many points of view materialized at all is testimony to the force of public opinion. The last such conference (1978) had been held at the peak of "stagnation," and it had conformed to the times. The delegates to what was then called the All-Union Teachers' Congress applauded and cheered upon command and voted unanimously when needed. Public opinion in the 1980's, alerted to the possibilities for restructuring the entire educational system and anticipating a new conference, insisted upon a democratic method for the selection of delegates. No support existed for a closed selection process.

The CPSU Central Committee and other directive agencies heeded the voice of reform and a more open selection of delegates was followed. This was not without controversy as *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, among other critics, challenged the new "democratic" election procedures. Nevertheless, the All-Union Congress of Workers in Public Education did convene under its new name which reflected the broader based participation of employees in the USSR State Committee of Education which is made up of the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, and the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education.[76]

Organizational skirmishes aside, the All-Union Congress did get on with its most serious work to resolve the major directions for education in the 1990's. This eclipsed the Pedagogy of Cooperation as an issue in itself although its spirit permeated concepts adopted. Zoya Malkova has provided an insightful summary of some of the more philosophic points in the resolutions adopted. She stated that the Congress, reflecting a broad base of professional and public opinion, supported fundamental changes in education. Influenced by the Leninist concept of school and the writings of Krupskaia and Lunarcharski, the conferees identified six key principles for incorporation: continuity, decentralization, democrtaization, humanization, individualization and differentiation, and integration.

Malkova believes that each of these when implemented "will transform the image of the Soviet school so as to make it an active participant in the *perestroika* of Soviet society." The following summarizes briefly her reconception.

<u>Continuity</u> relates to a unified system of lifelong learning which will enable people to switch from one occupation to another, acquire new knowledge, and enrich their cultural horizons through continuous self-education and self-improvement. As Professor Malkova has indicated, this goal is complicated by the need to integrate every level of education from pre-school

through graduate school and to establish a system of continuous coordination between and among them in terms of aims, content, methods of education, moral upbringing, and personality development. A gigantic undertaking!

Decentralization of education addresses the unique needs in a vast multi-national country. Malkova pointed out that all fifteen republics have bridled under the constraints of a centralized administration, sometimes insensitive to local conditions and aspirations. The transfer of authority to regional jurisdiction is intended to bring educational institutions closer to "national peculiarities." As cultural and ethnic differences are taken into account, the expectation is that the system of education will become more diverse, flexible, and responsive.

Just how this shift in authority will impact the fulfillment of national priorities, or indeed, the very perpetuation of Soviet nationalism remains to be seen.

Democratization is intended to manifest itself through local decision-making bodies such as councils made up of elected representatives from the general public, parents, and students who will have the final authority on all matters educational, including the nomination of school principals. Extra funds are to be made available to these councils "to pay for curricular

activities not foreseen in the ordinary curriculum." Other goals under democratization do include the full development of pupil self-rule, the creation of a psychologically comfortable atmosphere in schools, and the strengthening of constructive and mutually satisfying relations between teachers and pupils and between teachers and parents.

Whether the Soviets have calculated the potential in this new organization for chaos, bitter local rivalries, and student anarchy, which could result without the adoption of guidelines matching freedom with responsibility, is not clear.. They might find it useful to review the experiences of the New York City public schools in the 1960's as they grappled with the issues of decentralization and democratization. The realities of local politics forced a total retrenchment despite the need for organizational reform. The possible lack of resources for the infusion of extra funds into an educational system already under-funded and strained to meet its current obligations, may be the source of great discontent and disillusionment at the local level for the Soviets, too.

Humanization in Soviet educational terms is being described as the overcoming of technocratic approaches by lasting spiritual and moral values which belong to all mankind. In the classroom this will translate into the recognition of the unique individuality of

the child and close collaboration between teachers and pupils. It will impact curriculum and instruction to the extent that a new way of thinking must be taught which emphasizes the unity of man and nature and the necessary harmony between them. Understanding the unity of the world, the interdependence of countries and peoples, and the necessity for their close cooperation for the sake of preserving mankind are all part of the new thinking. The implementation of such a humanization philosophy will force a meaningful reorganization of school life and give school "a new face."

Such worthy ideals may have a chance to become part of the intellectual repertoire of the thinking Soviet. However, it will not be achieved easily. History has shown the challenges most countries have encountered in values education. It seems always subject to the buffeting of public opinion and to the general confusion about emphasis, appropriate materials, and teacher commitment. According to their own testimony the satisfactory inculcation of ideals has eluded the Soviets even under a highly centralized administration. It is hard to imagine the chances for any immediate success under the planned decentralization.

Individualization and Differentiation concerns itself (1) with paying more attention to individual characteristics of students and with creating more appropriate conditions for the development of

their individual interests, abilities, aptitudes, and value orientations. Dr. Malkova views this as one of the key principles of *perestroika*. Quite correctly she has identified a major stumbling block to its implementation in the lack of enough trained support personnel such as psychologists in the schools. (2) Differentiation relates to individualization through the introduction of more optional courses and electives throughout the school system as a way to satisfy special student needs. At the secondary level thirty percent of regular study time will be devoted to such options and electives. The Soviets might exercise some caution in this regard. The unsuccessful U.S. experimentation with such open choices in the curriculum has caused most states to legislate a more prescribed course of study to ensure that learning priorities are mastered.

Integration signifies a trend to unite and coordinate all types of formal and non-formal educational institutions and experiences with the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of the socialization process and guaranteeing the all-round development of the child. This is not a new concept for the Soviets as their revered educator, A. S. Makarenko, many years ago expressed it as "every stretch of social space has a socializing effect."[77].

The possibilities for success to incorporate this over-arching principle in a decentralized administrative model with its endless

variabilities staggers the imagination. The best chances for the realization of such an ideal may be to pilot it in select and very small scale settings and then export it for wider consumption.

The All-Union Congress passed other important resolutions, the significance of which only the future can reveal. An excellent precedent has been set. Now more frequent conferences of workers in education need to be scheduled on the local, regional, and national levels to reevaluate priorities, to clarify the philosophic intent underlying all their goals and objectives, to thrash out what constitutes the most effective instructional strategies, and to evaluate the best ways research can become the handmaiden to classroom practice.

CONCLUSION

Gorbachev's leadership rests on the success of *perestroika, glasnost, and demokratizatsiya* as galvanizers for the new Soviet man and woman who will lead the second stage of the Revolution. Creativity, independence, initiative, resourcefulness, and technical intelligence will be important personality dimensions among a citizenry charged with recasting a new society. Intense activity and monumental cooperation in many arenas and among millions of people will be vital to accomplish this.

The history of the Russians and other Soviets in the Union should prepare them and the rest of the world for a long period of inequality, instability, and insecurity (in contrast to Brezhnev's social contract of "Equality, Stability, and Security"). What has been awakened and unleashed here is an intelligent, energetic, crafty, suspicious, and opportunistic hydra, an old soul, with the heartbeat of youth. How such a complex organism can be channelled to fulfill national priorities, live competitively in the international world of the 21st Century, and develop its own individuality while continuing to chew on the eternal verities of Marxism and Leninism, may continue to astound the world.

If the educational establishment can be mobilized quickly, chances for success are even better. Good teachers will need retraining, and superior people will need to be enticed into the profession. What is needed further is balance in the overall: the commitment to decentralize educational administration yet the preservation of a quality curriculum and instructional program; the practice of democraticization in relationships yet an understanding that freedom has its responsibilities; and the accepatance of new ways of thinking yet an acknowledgement that fundamentals change slowly.

Stirrings portend that Soviet teachers will have greater opportunities for empoverment; school administrators at the local and district levels may dare to take proactive stances; and academics in education may engage once again in meaningful research to support some of the popular hypotheses of the day. A number of important professional educational issues need serious attention if a more effective delivery system is to be chartered out. None of these present the hurdle that the funding and meeting of other national priorities do. Whether education as an institution can stand up to the competition for funds remains an unknown. Even impartial observers in the study of comparative education, however, hardly can remain disinterested on the sidelines. The Soviet Union is in ferment. The stakes for that nation and the rest of the world hang in the balance.

****

References

---

[1] Mikhail Gorbachev, *Perestroika*. New Thinking for Our Country and the World. (New York, Harper & Row, 1987):254 p.

2. James Muckle, *A Guide to the Soviet Curriculum:* What the Russian Child is Taught in School. (London, Croom Helm, 1988):189 p. This presents the reader with an excellent overview of the curriculum taught to the vast majority of youth in the Soviet mass educational system.

[3]Polytechnic education in Soviet terminology means acquainting pupils with contemporary production theory and practice and with the relationship between society and production. (This word production is commonly used in Russian to mean industry in the broadest sense.) Polytechnic education also means "effective labour training," the formation of working skills, knowledge enough to make a rational choice of career, and of foundation for consequent professional training. Muckle, *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[4]The great 19th Century spokesman for humanitarian education was N. I. Pirogov. He believed that the primary goal of education was to prepare humankind for the "inner struggle." This translated into a general curriculum in which time would be devoted to developing the students' inner strengths and character. This did not exclude the existence of special schools with practical or applied aims. However, such further study would be built on the foundation of a humanitarian education base. Nicholas A. Hans, *The Russian Tradition in Education* (London, Routedge & Kegan Paul, 1963):45-64.

[5]*Ibid.*, p.99.

[6]Readers interested in the kinds of educational issues raised should consult several sources. Refer to *Current Digest of the Soviet Press* (Volume XXXVI, Nos. 3,4,8,9, and 14) summarized in Beatrice Beach Szekely, "Editor's Introduction," to *Soviet Education*, The Adoption of New Soviet School Reforms, Part II, vol. XXVII, nos. 6-7 (April-May 1985):6,7.

Refer to *The Teacher's Gazette, (Uchitel'skais gazetta)*, a thrice weekly national newspaper published in Moscow. Good excerpts

include, Vladimar Tendriakov, "The School and Self-Knowledge," *Ibid.*, pp. 79-84, trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta, "Shkola i samopoznanie"* (Thursday, March 1, 1984); The CPSU Central Committee Draft: The Teacher's View, "The Draft is Good! Let the Building Begin," *Ibid.*, pp. 85-92, trans. from *Ibid., "Proekt khorosh! Pora stroit'"* (Saturday, March 24, 1984); I. Zverev (VicePresident of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences), "Pedagogical Science on School Reform: One Year Earlier" (Parts I, II, III), *I bid.*, pp. 93-98; 99-103; 104-108, trans. from *Ibid., "Na god ran'she"* (Wednesday, March 29, 1984); (Saturday, March 31, 1984); (Tuesday, April 3, 1984).

Refer to a lengthy report from the editors of *Kommunist* as found in "A Matter That Affects the Interests of the Entire People," *Ibid.* pp. 48-78, Russian text, copywrite 1984 by "Pravda" Publishers. "*Delo, zatragivaiushchee interesy vsego naroda,*" *Kommunist,* no. 4 (1984):79-89.

[7]For readers interested in examining the cyclical history of educational reforms in the Soviet Union which predated the 1980's (and also had its disillusionments) Iu. S. Borisov's article presents a succinct analysis, dating from 1905-1907 and the Bolshevik's call for fundamental school reform. Iu. S. Borisov (Holds the academic degree of doctor of history and the rank of professor and is a deputy section head in the Institute of History at the USSR Academy of Sciences), "Realization of the Communist Party's Program for the Development of Public Education," *Ibid.*, vol. XXVII, no. 5 (March 1985):1-21. Russian text copywrite 1983 by "Pedagogika" Publishers. Trans. from "*Realizatsiia programmnykh trebovaniia KPSS o razvitii narodnogo obrazovaniia,*" *Sovetskaia pedagogika,* no. 7 (1983):3-13.

[8]"Fundamental Directions of General Education and Vocational Reform Endorsed by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 10 April and by the USSR Supreme Soviet on 12 April (1984)," *Ibid,* vol. XXVII, no. 6-7 (April-May 1985):158-191, trans. from *Ibid., "Odobreno Plenumum TsK KPSS 10 aprelia i Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR 12 aprelia: Osnovnye napravleniia reformy obshcheobrazovatel'noi i professional'noi shkoly."* (Tuesday, April 17, 1984).

[9]. *Ibid.*, pp. 163, 165, 184.

[10]Ele Isaevich Monoszon, "Development and Current Status of the Theory of Communist Upbringing," *Soviet Education,* The Establishment and Development of Soviet Pedagogy, Excerpts (III), vol. 31, no. 1 (January, 1989):5-43.

[11]T. I. Baranova and N. S. Rozyeva, "From the History of the Experimental Teaching of Six Year Old Children in the USSR (1945-1980)," *Soviet Education*, vol. XXVII, no. 5 (March 1985):22-38, trans. from *Sovetskaia pedagogika*," *Iz istorii eksperimental'nogo obucheniia shestiletnykh detei v SSSR (1945-1980)*," no. 7 (1983):103-109.

[12]Beatrice Beach Szekely, "The New Soviet Educational Reform," *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 30, no. 3 (August 1986):334.

[13]Beatrice Beach Szekely, "Editor's Introduction," *Soviet Education*, Hello Children! A Teacher's Guide, vol. XXX, no. 44 (April 1988):4.

[14]"Fundamental Directions...", *Ibid.*, p. 169.

[15]On my recent visit to the Soviet Union (June-July, 1988) I had an opportunity to visit two preschool programs, one in Krasnador on the Leninswill collective farm and the other in the city of Sochi, Kindergarten #24, the "Small Ship." Enrollments were at the norm or under; however, the principals reported that overcrowding was a pervasive problem.

[16] Szekely, *Ibid.*

[17]Speech by Comrade G. A. Yagodin, Chairman of the USSR State Committee on Public Education. *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press* vol. XL, no. 34 (September 21, 1988):15, 24, trans. from *Pravda* (July 2, 1988):9; *Izvestia* (July 2, 1988):8.

[18]*Ibid.*

[19]"Education Congress: Any Progress?" A speech by G. A. Yagodin, "Through Humanization and Democratization, Toward a New Quality of Education," *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. XL, no. 52 (January 25, 1989):3, trans. from *Pravda* (December 21, 1988):3.

[20]"On Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the Tasks of Promoting *Perestroika*." Report of Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, at the 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU (June 28, 1988). *MN Moscow News*, Supplement to issue no. 27 (3327) (1988,):1.

[21]"A Speech by Comrade M. Iakubova," *Soviet Education*, Reformulating the Educational Reform. Central Decision Making, Part I, vol. 31, no. 2 (February, 1989):51 as trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, *"Rech' Tovarishcha Iakubovoi M."* (*Direktor*

Urgenchskoi shkoly-internata No. 94 Khorezmskoi oblasti Uzbekskoi SSR) (March 4, 1986):2.

[22]California Coalition for Fair School Finance, "Facilities & Students: The Issues," vol. X (December, 1986):1-6.

[23]Beatrice Beach Szekely, "Editor's Introduction," *Soviet Education*, The Adoption of New Soviet School Reforms, vol. XXVII, no. 5 (March 1985):*vi,vii*. For a comparison with the pre-reform structure refer to an article in the same issue, Iu. P. Averichev (USSR Minister of Education), "Increasing the Effectiveness of the System for the Preparation of School Pupils for Labor," pp. 85-102., trans. from *Sovetskaia pedagogika, "Povyshat' effektivnost'sistemy trudovoi podgotovki shkol'nikov,"* no 9 (1983):16-23.

[24]Szekely, "The New Educational...", *Ibid.*, p. 336

[25]*Ibid.*, p. 335.

[26]In speaking with a prominent Soviet academician, Professor Victor V. Kabakchi (Leningrad, July 10, 1988) of the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute I was able to verify that the intelligensia held very strongly negative opinions concerning the efficacy of the universal vocational education for the intellectually elite. A similar position was expressed to me by Igor A. Yurin, Dean of Foreign Students, Kuban State Medical. Institute. (Krasnodar, July 3, 1988).

[27]Beatrice Beach Szekely, "Editor's Introduction," *Soviet Education*, Education in the Modern World. Present Status and Developmental Tendencies, Part II, vol. XXX, no. 7 (July 1988):3.

[28]Szekely, "The New Educational...," *Ibid.*, p. 336.

[29]*Ibid.*, p. 335.

[30]"Fundamental Directions...", *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[31]*Ibid.*, *p.* 182-183.

[32]Szekely, *Ibid.*

[33]Zoya Malkova, "Key Principles of *Perestroika* in Soviet Education." An unpublished address given at the annual conference of the Comparative International and Educational Society, Harvard University, April 1, 1989. Dr. Malkova is the

Director, Institute of General Pedagogics, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow, USSR.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] "Education Congress...," Yagodin, "Through Humanization...," *Ibid.*, pp. 1 and 3.

[36] "Fundamental Directions...", pp. 182-185.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 187-188.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] Shcherbakov's career which included over thirty years in Party political administration prepared him uniquely for this new assignment. He had served with distinction the previous eleven years as First Deputy Head of the Department of Research and Educational Institutions, the powerful Communist Party decision-making body whose policy and personnel decisions outrank those of the USSR Ministry of Education's executive Collegium. On his sixtieth birthday, Shcherbakov was awarded the order of Lenin by the USSR Supreme Soviet in recognition of "services (already rendered) in the developement of learning and public education...." *Ibid.* Refer to "Decree of Presidium of USSR Supreme Soviet," *Pravda* (September 21, 1984), trans. in *CDSP* 37, no. 38 (October 16, 1985):21.

[40] Szekely, "The New Soviet Educational...," *Ibid.*, pp. 336-337.

[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 337-338. Refer also to Iaian Elliot, "And Now Gorbachev, the Great Reformer," *Survey* 29, no. 1 (Spring 1985):7; Stephen F. Cohen, *Rethinking the Soviet Experience, Politics and History Since 1917.* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1985):131.

[42] Szekely, *Ibid.*, pp. 328-330.

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] A brief review of the organization of post complete secondary school offers an explanation why Shcherbakov's effort could not be effective totally. Further technical-vocational education opportunites did continue under the auspices of the USSR Ministry of Higher Education and Secondary Specialized Education. This was separate from the jurisdiction of the USSR Ministry of Education which Shcherbakov headed. The so called secondary specialized education program (post complete

secondary school) included technicums and training colleges while higher education encompassed institutes and the universities. The furcated education routes taken by the graduates of the ten and eleven year programs needed coordination with the school feeder programs. Currently one third of the secondary general education school graduates go onto secondary specialized educational institutions or higher education institutes and universities; one third enter one-year job training programs in technical schools; and one third go directly to work where on the job training may be an option. Szekely, "Editor's Introduction," "The Adoption of New...," *Ibid.*

[45]Reported in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. XL, no. 15 (May 11, 1988):24.

[46]Beatreice Beach Szekely, "Editor's Introduction," *Soviet Education*, Innovative Teaching for the Soviet School Reform. The Pedagogy of Cooperation, Part I, vol. XXX, no. 2 (February 1988):3-8.

[47]Of the seven spokesmen four held positions as school teachers, one as teacher/principal, one as research assistant, and one, a professor. (S. N. Lysenkova, a meritorious school teacher of the RSFSR, teaches at school no. 587 in Moscow; V. F. Shatalov works at an institute of teacher improvement and teaches in school no. 5 in Donetsk; I. P. Volkov (Cand. Ped. Sc.), a meritorious schoolteacher of the RSFSR, teaches in school no. 2 in Reutovo, Moscow Region; V. A. Karakovskii (Cand. Ped. Sc.) is a meritorious schoolteacher of the RSFSR and principal of Moscow's school no. 825; M. P. Shchetinin is a senior research associate at the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences' Institute of General Problems of Upbringing; E. N. Il'in is a teacher-methodologist at Leningrad's school no. 307; and Professor Sh. A. Amonashvili (D. Psych. Sc.) is a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and Director of the Ia. S. Gogebashvili Scientific Research Institute of Pedagogical Sciences in Tbilisi.) *Ibid.*, p. 82, footnote in "The Pedagogy of Cooperation, authored by these seven teacher-innovators.

[48]*Ibid.*, pp. 86-88.

[49]*Ibid.*, *pp.* 90-93.

[50]*Ibid.*

[51]*Ibid.*, pp. 93-96.

[52]*Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 97-98.

[54] E. N. Il'in, "And Suddenly a Lesson is Born," *Ibid.*, p. 19, trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, "*I vdrug rozhdaetsia urok*" (June 28, 1986):3.

[55] S. Soloveichik, "Letter to a Teacher about a Teacher," *Ibid.*, p. 36, trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*," "*Pis'mo uchiteliu ob uchitele*" (September 20, 1986):2; (September 23, 1986):2; (September 25, 1986):4.

[56] V. F. Shatalov, "Give Me a School!," *Ibid.*, pp. 54-67, trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, "*Daite mne shkolu*" (October 7, 1986):4.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

[58] P. R. Atutov, Iu. K. Babanskii, A. A. Bodalev, I. D. Zverev, M. R. L'vov, Z. A. Mal'kova, M. N. Skatin, and G. N. Filonov, "The Union Of Science and Practice," *Soviet Education*, Innovative Teaching for the Soviet School Reform. The Pedagogy of Cooperation, Part II, vol. XXX, no. 3 (March 1988):54-70, trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, "*Souiz nauki i praktikii*" (December 18, 1986):2.

[59] These issues included: (1) the nurturing of a comprehensively developed personality, with due regard for acceleration of the socioeconomic development of the country; (2) improvement of the content and methods of teaching; (3) the school textbook; (4) computers in the school; (5) the school and labor; (6) the school and child health; (7) the teacher in the Soviet school; and (8) the secondary vocational-technical training school. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

[64] S. Soloveichik, "The School of Trust," *Ibid.*, pp. 71-76, trans. from *Ibid.*, "*Shkola doveriia*" (January 17, 1987):2.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 71, 75.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[67]"Steering a Course Together," *Ibid.*, pp. 77-79, trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta, "Kurs derzhim vmeste"* (January 29, 1987):4.

[68]M. I. Palashicheva, Z. M. Fil'kina, E. M. Semakova, L. M. Dokuchaeva, V. V. Krasil'nikova, and L. Ia. Val'kov, "The Inspector in Favor of Cooperation," *Ibid.*, pp. 25-36., trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta, "Inspektor za sotrudnichestvo. Otchet o vstreche shkol'nykh inspektorov"* (November 15, 1986):2.

[69]Professor I. E. Plotnieks, chairman of the Latvia Division of the All-Union Society of Psychologists, teaches in Leningrad State University's Department of Pedagogy and Psychology; Associate Professor L. Ia. Grudulis is chairman of the presidium of the Latvian Republic of Pedagogical Society; O. K. Zids is the acting dean of Leningrad State University's Pedagogical Faculty; A. I. Gusev is an associate professor; I. A. Pushkarev (D. Bio. Sc.) is a professor; and D. Ia. Albrekhta and G. A. Berklavs are senior instructors. The report comes from Riga.

[70](Authors above), "Scholars in Favor of Cooperation," *Ibid.*, p. 39, trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta, "Uchenye za sotrudnichestvo. Otchet o vstreche pedadodov-uchenykh"* (December 6, 1986):2.

[71]*Ibid.*, pp. 40, 41.

[72]*Ibid.*, p. 45.

[73]"Geared to Educators," *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. XL, no. 50 (January 11, 1989):24. Note that the crusading reporter, Simon Soloveichik, may be a visiting scholar at Kent State University and other institutions for the 1989-1990 academic year.

[74]"Education Congress...," Yagodin, "Through Humanization...," *Ibid.*, p. 3 and speeches of other delegates, pp. 4-7; and excerpt from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, "The Congress Is The Beginning Of Our Work," p. 7 as trans. from *Uchitel'skaia gazeta*, (December 27, 1988):1-2.

[75]Speech by Comrade G. A. Yagodin..., *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[76]"Teachers' Congress: Election Without Rules," *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. XL, no. 45 (December 7, 1988):23,24.

[77]Malkova, *Ibid.*